

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

PCT

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | Date of mailing<br>(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet) |
| Applicant's or agent's file reference<br>see form PCT/ISA/220  |  | <b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b><br>See paragraph 2 below                      |
| International application No<br>PCT/EP2004/009779  | International filing date (day/month/year)<br>02.09.2004 | Priority date (day/month/year)<br>25.09.2003                            |
| International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC<br>B60P1/64, B65D88/00 |  |   |
| Applicant<br>FENATI, Roberto   |  |   |

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No I Basis of the opinion
- Box No II Priority
- Box No III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis 1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No VI Certain documents cited
- Box No VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No VIII Certain observations on the international application

2 **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66 1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220

3 For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Visentin, M

Telephone No +49 89 2399-2614



10/573178

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/009779

~~1 AD 20 Rec'd 2006-03-16 2006-03-16 2006-03-16 2006-03-16~~

**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

1 With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item

This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23 1(b))

2 With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material:

a sequence listing

table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material:

in written format

in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing:

contained in the international application as filed.

filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3.  In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/009779

**Box No. II Priority**

1.  The following document has not been furnished:

copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a))  
 translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2.  This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1) Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3  It has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the priority document was not available to the ISA at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1) This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or  
industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

|                               |             |          |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------|
| Novelty (N)                   | Yes: Claims |          |
|                               | No: Claims  | 1        |
| Inventive step (IS)           | Yes: Claims |          |
|                               | No: Claims  | 2-4, 6-8 |
| Industrial applicability (IA) | Yes: Claims | 1-8      |
|                               | No: Claims  |          |

2. Citations and explanations

**see separate sheet**

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING  
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/009779

1. The following documents are referred to in this communication:  
D1 : US 2 892 556 A  
D2 : GB 1 341 970 A  
D3 : DE 22 39 779 A
2. D1 is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of claim 1. It discloses a truck provided with a container body for transporting goods comprising an extractable flatbed provided with jack assembly according to the definition of independent claim 1.
- 2.1 The present application therefore does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.
3. Moreover, just for completeness of information, it is observed that claim 1 couldn't be considered even as involving an inventive step in view of the teaching of D2 in combination with the disclosure of D3. In fact, the skilled person, looking to solve the problem of using the structure disclosed in D2 even by a not existing loading ramp, find a possible solution in the jack assembly described in document D3, a feature which is looked as providing the same advantages as in the present application. Therefore the features disclosed in D2 and D3 would be combined by the skilled person, without exercise of any inventive skills in order to solve the problem posed. The proposed solution in independent claim 1 thus cannot be considered inventive (Article 33(3) PCT).
4. Dependent claims 2, 6, 8 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT).
  - 4.1 The additional features of dependent claims 3, 4, 7 are not disclosed in their present form in any of the documents cited in the search report. However, they are regarded as merely one of several straightforward possibilities from which the skilled person would select, in accordance with circumstances, without the exercise of inventive skill, in order to solve the problem posed.
  - 4.2 The combination of the features of dependent claim 5 is neither known from, nor rendered obvious by, the available prior art.